UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/596,783	06/19/2000	Carl J. Kraenzel	LOT9-2000-0006 US1	3747

27085	7590	03/18/2004

IBM CORPORATION
LOTUS SOFTWARE
ONE ROGERS STREET
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02142

EXAMINER
PANNALA, SATHYANARAYA R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2177	

DATE MAILED: 03/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/596,783	KRAENZEL ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Sathyanarayan Pannala	2177

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>23 December 2003</u> .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-22</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-22</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: .

. **DETAILED ACTION**

1.   Applicant's Amendment filed on 12/23/2003 includes amended claims 1-2,

6-8, 14, and 20-22. As per this Office Action claims 1-22 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as
> set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented
> and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

> This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims
> under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was
> commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the
> contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and
> invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in
> order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e),
> (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3.   Claims 1-2, 4-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

McGee (US Patent 6,393,468), and in view of Sutter (US Patent 6,446,092).

4.   McGee teaches independent claims 1, 6-7, 21 by the following:

"a database for storing user passwords" at Fig. 3, col. 7, lines 65-67;

"a plurality of subscriptions, each identified by a subscription user credential

"a service manager for executing concurrent replication of a plurality of said

subscriptions on schedule or demand for which a password corresponding to

said subscription credential has been provided by a user or found in said

database" at Fig. 3, col. 8, lines 16-37.

McGee does not teach explicitly offline subscription. However, Sutter teaches

the following limitations:

"including password, user name and authentic table electronic certificate, said

subscription providing a logical grouping of data, applications, and application-

instance security context" at col. 7, lines 1-18;

"service manager replicating to a user browser an offline subscription containing

client-side runtime framework for a fully functioning offline server." Independent

Distributed Database system (IDDS) work offline with local data and all

application transactions are against a local database. Sites sharing the same

data synchronize their changes periodically in the background and changes

made at one site become visible to all the other interested sites (at Fig. 1, col. 10,

lines 21-33). The replication engine 24, the administrator application 26, and the

user application 28 are run-time processes (at Fig. 4, col. 12, lines 40-64). Thus,

it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the

invention to include IDDS to work offline with local database and replicating

databases periodically in the background.

5.   As per independent claim 2, McGee teaches the following:

"a utility responsive to user input for concurrently replicating on schedule or

demand subscriptions for which said user has entered a user password matching

said subscription password" at Fig. 3, col. 9, lines 40-49.

McGee does not teach explicitly offline subscription. However, Sutter teaches

the following limitations:

"a plurality of web-enabled, offline subscriptions each identified by user

credentials including user identifier and subscription password, said subscription

providing a logical grouping of data, applications, and application-instance

security context" at col. 7, lines 1-18;

"a service manager for displaying to a user a plurality of said subscriptions, for

enabling user selection of replication parameters for each said subscription, for

maintaining replication schedules for said subscriptions, and for replicating to a

user browser an offline subscription containing client-side runtime and framework

for a fully functioning offline server." The replication engine 24, the administrator

application 26, and the user application 28 are run-time processes (at Fig. 4, col.

12, lines 40-64).   Thus, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in

the art at the time of the invention to include IDDS to work offline with local

database and replicating databases periodically in the background.

6.   As per dependent claim 4, Sutter teaches "plurality of web enabled, offline

subscriptions are from multiple servers and from multiple user identities, and selectively

having separate database groupings and synchronization rules and properties" at Fig. 4

col. 16, lines 30-49.

7.   As per dependent claim 5, McGee teaches by the following:

"a user password database for optionally storing said user password for each of

said plurality of subscriptions" at Fig. 3 & 4, col. 10, lines 12-43;

"said utility being selectively responsive to a matching user password in said

password database for replicating a corresponding subscription and responsive

to no matching user password in said password database for prompting for user

input of said user password before replicating said corresponding subscription"

at Fig. 4 & 5, col. 10, line 63 to col. 11, line 12.

8.   As per the independent claims 8, 14, 22, McGee teaches the following:

"a database of security domains" at Fig. 3, col. 8, lines 38-48;

"system electronic certificates for authenticating user credentials" at Fig. 3 & 4,

col. 10, lines 12-18;

 "a tool responsive to said database and said certificates for distributing user

identifiers selectively based upon security domain through auto generation,

directory lookup or user prompt" at Fig. 6, col. 11, lines 56-67.

McGee does not teach explicitly offline subscription. However, Sutter teaches

"subscription containing client-side runtime and framework for a fully functioning

offline server for offline operation of a client browser by providing a logical

grouping of data, applications, and application-instance security context" at

Fig. 3, col. 8, lines 16-37 and col. 7, lines 1-18. Independent Distributed

Database system (IDDS) work offline with local data and all application

transactions are against a local database. Sites sharing the same data

synchronize their changes periodically in the background and changes made at

one site become visible to all the other interested sites (at Fig. 1, col. 10, lines

21-33). The replication engine 24, the administrator application 26, and the user

application 28 are run-time processes (at Fig. 4, col. 12, lines 40-64). Thus, it

would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the

invention to include IDDS to work offline with local database and replicating

databases periodically in the background.

9.   As per dependent claims 9, 15, McGee teaches the following:

"an identifier repository database" at Fig. 6, col. 12, lines 17-18;

"a security domain document in said database of security domains for use in

locating in said identifier repository database a user identifier selected for

distribution based upon directory lookup" at Fig. 6, col. 12, lines 19-29.

10.   As per dependent claims 10, 16, McGee teaches "a security domain document

from said database of security domains for specifying an electronic certificate for use in

auto generating a user identifier selected for distribution based upon auto generation"

at Fig. 6, col. 11, lines 45-67.

11.   As per dependent claims 11, 17, McGee teaches "prompt code for execution in

response to a need for a user entered user identifier" at Fig. 3, col. 10, lines 14-18.

12.   As per dependent claim 12, 18, McGee teaches "a security model for enabling

the distribution of previously deployed user identifiers by table lookup" at Fig. 3-4 & 8,

col. 12, lines 58-63.

13.   As per dependent claims 13, 19, McGee teaches the following:

"prompt code for execution in response to a need for a user entered user

identifier" at Fig. 3, col. 10, lines 14-18;

"a security model for enabling the distribution of previously deployed user

identifiers by table lookup" at Fig. 3-4 & 8, col. 12, lines 58-63.

14.   As per the independent claim 20, McGee teaches the following:

"providing a database of security domains" at Fig. 3, col. 8, lines 38-48;

McGee does not teach explicitly offline subscription. However, Sutter teaches

"responsive to said database, distributing user identifiers for subscription

containing client-side runtime framework for a fully functioning offline server for

offline operation of a client browser selectively based upon security domain

through auto generation, directory lookup or user prompt, said subscription

providing a logical grouping of data, applications, and application-instance

security context" Independent Distributed Database system (IDDS) work offline

with local data and all application transactions are against a local database.

Sites sharing the same data synchronize their changes periodically in the

background and changes made at one site become visible to all the other

interested sites (at Fig. 1, col. 10, lines 21-33, and col. 7, lines 1-18). The

replication engine 24, the administrator application 26, and the user application

28 are run-time processes (at Fig. 4, col. 12, lines 40-64). Thus, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to include IDDS to work offline with local database and replicating databases periodically in the background.

15.   Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McGee (US Patent 6,393,468), in view of Sutter (US Patent 6,446,092), and further in view of Forbes et al. (US Patent 6,381,742).

16.   As per dependent claim 3, McGee and Sutter do not teach explicitly the disk space needed for the document on the Internet. However, Forbes teaches "service manager further displaying disk space usage for enabling user limitation of usage or removal of said subscription" (at col. 12, line 29 to col. 14, line 3). Thus, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to include information on disk space needed to access an internet document in order to check the disk space on the client computer.

Response to Arguments

17.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-2, 4-22 and 3 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive and details as follows:

A)   The applicant states as "There is no teaching in McGee of a 'subscription', as applicants have defined the term."

In response to Applicants' argument, Examiner respectfully disagrees because McGee is not teaching all claims and Shutter and Forbes covering the other claimed invention. Sutter reference teaches the concept of subscription. Sutter teaches as Independent Distributed Database (IDDB) system works offline with local data and all application transactions are against a local database. Sites sharing the same data synchronize their changes periodically in the background and changes made at one site become visible to all the other interested sites (at Fig. 1, col. 10, lines 21-33). The replication engine 24, the administrator application 26, and the user application 28 are run-time processes (at Fig. 4, col. 12, lines 40-64).

B)   The applicant states as "While Shutter is a peer to peer system, applicants' invention..." see on page 18, lines 1-4.

In response to the applicants' argument, examiner agrees that shutter teaches the system with the communication is peer to peer. But it is the only the one aspect. For details, Shutter teaches an independent distributed database (IDDB) system, comprises an application database running as a virtual network, which is defined by sites running a given IDDB application on a physical network communication. All nodes work individually and share the same data synchronization. There are network transactions for replication and security mechanisms are provided for securing transactions (col. 91, lines 22-43).

Conclusion

18.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Sathyanarayan Pannala whose telephone number is

(703) 305-3390. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (703) 305-9790. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sathyanarayan Pannala
Examiner
Art Unit 2177

srp
March 12, 2004

GRETA ROBINSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER